INTRODUCTION (MENTION EVERYTHING BUT IN GENERAL, SHOULD INTRODUCE AND SUMMARIZE MY MOTIVATION, REASONS AND INTERESTS IN THIS SUBJECT, BUT ALSO SET THE QUESTION AND SHOW THE WAY TO AN ANSWER)

----

1) INTRODUCTION / SOCIETY LOCKED INTO PAST / DIGITALIZATION OF MEDIA MAKES IT VISIBLE / PROCESSING PAST THROUGH COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND MEMORIAL CULTURE / DIFFICULT PAST / MONUMENTS IN GENERAL / INTERNET / MEDIA SWITCH FROM COLLECTIVE TO CONNECTIVE / THESIS QUESTION (1000 words)

2) YUGOSLAVIA THEN (historical overview - where it all started, ideology, collective memory, monuments - ideology change, identity confusion, culture of memory current state) (1000)

3) EX YUGOSLAVIA NOW (political situation, ideology changes, identity confusion, how that reflects on the monuments, destruction of old, errection of new, turbo sculpture phenomenon) (1000)

5) MASS MEDIA, COLLECTIVE MEMORY -//- DIGITAL MEDIA, CONNECTIVE MEMORY (switch in the media ecology) (1000)

4) THE INTERNET / YOUTUBE AND ITS SPECIFICITIES (its relationship with the broadcast media, as a followup, same content we used to watch it on the tv, politics of monuments, politics of the internet) (need more material here!) (1000)

6) HYPOTHESIS (elaboration through comparison, what is a monument exactly, its characteristics, what is happening on the youtube exactly, examples) (2000-3000)

7) CONCLUSION (500 words)

MESS / NOTES / QUESTIONS

- places where we remember, i will argue that the place in front of your computer is also a place
(Television as a Gathering Place, Paul. C. Adams)
- to whom am i writing this? croatia / everyone? how detailed should it be?
- these monuments are not for specific puposes and events, they are general, and they trigger conflicts from all the historical periods
- body of work, yugoslav music and culture
- mention other instances, like news comments, forums, facebook...
- should i go into the historical details or just explain the principles
- more emphasis on the medium (internet)!
- a lot has been said about this topic (the problematics of yu monuments), but isn't it time to see how the internet influenced it, and where can it leads us?
- how the memorial problematics and the incompetence in dealing with it has reflected on the internet
- half of the thesis has more specialised chapters, with more quoting / the second part elaboration part more in my own words?
- Je li vrijeme da drugačije gledamo na monumente, možda ovo nije najbolje rješenje, ali postavlja pitanja. Ima li više mjesta za tradicionalno shvaćanje toga. Možda primjeri digitalnih spomenika?
- always keep in mind: what is neccessary to prove my point?
- project: focusing on personal memories of collectve history?
- the lack of healthy collective memory makes people turn to their own interpretations that contributes to the chaotical media and memorial culture and ecology.
- YT - a container, an empty monument, people inscribe meaning to it
- translating comments as examples?
- yugo-nostalgia blogs
- examples of other "digital monuments"
- should i reveal my hypothesis in the introduction already, or just present it in general
- This paper will be dealing with (re)consummation of the past from the aspect of memorial culture and its form of embodyment - monuments, by taking the digital media as a new angle of looking onto the memorial culture.
- why is it important to go into details with the socialist monuments, because these narratives apear in the comments of the videos
- the politics of regimes, the politics of the internet and YouTube
- including rotterdam in the thesis, see how it applies to some other places
- and in the end, is it something to be valued, ignored or despised. the culture, functionality, symbolics, aethetics (conclusion, which is not a part of this thesis but might be a part of my project, personal opinion, feelings)

Some societies are preoccupied with the past more than others. This problematic phenomenon of a past refusing to become history is clearly visible when dealing with social characteristics of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. More than twenty years after the country dissolved, the narratives of the World War Two, as well as the ones of the 90's Yugoslav war are very much active, either as a part of yugo-nostalgia (a psychological and cultural phenomenon occurring among citizens of the former Yugoslavia), or unresolved political conflicts between the peoples and/or ethnic groups. The past remains the basis of both contemporary political discourse and everyday conversation, which is keeping the society from turning towards the future.

This social particulatrity became even more visible, readable and analyzable in the last decade of the post-broadcast age. Due to the technological and media infrastructures, top-down, one-to-many vertical models of the broadcast age, switched to bottom-up, many-to-many, horizontal, peer-to-peer communication, making the consumer into an active participant of the new media ecology.

The increasing digitalization and democratization of media spaces, driven by availability, interactivity and prevalence have enabled such narratives to emerge in both appropriate and inappropriate media spaces. The past has been constantly re-mediated, not only by the mainstream media formats, but also by individual citizens provoking tensions and conflicts. The best example of such activities is the interactive YouTube platform. Various types of content dating from the Yugoslav era, weather political or apolitical, activate positive or negative reactions in the comment section. Positive reactions and emotions are often expressed through memories and personal stories, while the negative ones are provoking heated arguments through insults and hate speech. "…the ongoing struggle between the contested historical narratives reveals that in many cases the facts of what happened are less important than the highly subjective and often emotional representations of the past." (Pavleković)

Besides the changes in media ecology, one of the reasons for this excessive re-consummeration of the past may be laying in society's inability to deal with and process its past events through its collective memory, which serves as an important element of preserving and transfering society's cultural capital, it's identity, coherence and therefore its existence. (Pavlaković)

French sociologist and developer of the collective memory concept, Maurice Halbwachs, argues that all memory is socially constructed. According to him, society forms a collective memory that is dependent upon the framework within which a group is situated in. Collective memory exists outside of and lives beyond the individual memory, while the individual's understanding of the past is strongly connected to the group consciousness. Both collective (institutionalized) and individual memory are subject to the needs of the present and can serve as an instrument of power and change the ways in which events are recorded and remembered, or discarded and forgotten. Government policies, as well as social rules and popular culture and media influence the way events are remembered. "Commemorations, textbooks, the naming of public spaces, and monuments are a few elements of institutionalized memory which states and regimes use to present their narrative of the past in order to justify the present political order." (Pavlaković)

Collective memory, produced through social, educational and memorial infrastructures of political ideologies and delivered through one-way mass media, leaves no space for the individual voices, while the collective narratives are easy to preserve and monumentalize. While collective memory produced in the broadcast age can be more readily analyzed within the context of politics, what kind of perspective on it do we have today?

Although the emergent field of memory studies is still hugely influenced by the concept of 'collective memory', this concept is now challenged by the technical developments of the new, post-broadcast age, with its contingencies and complexities of connectivity (Hoskins). With the increasing dominance of the new media, memory studies need a critical re-evaluation of the influence of digital mass communication on individual memory, collective memory and monumentalization historical narratives.

Embodiment and shaping memories in a form of a physical monument has always been one of the most common ways of dealing with, processing and reflecting on the historical events and figures. Collective memory of a nation is represented and constructed by the monuments it chooses to erect, as they symbolise and reinforse widely accepted common values and versions of history. They serve as symbols of identity as well as marks of personal and collective memory, they are places where we recognize and remember.

In a context of the countries of former Yugoslavia that emerged from a very turbulent twentieth century, shaped by the rise and fall of multiple empires, states, and ideologies, public monuments and their construction, destruction, restoration, or censorship present a tangible way of its historical narrative, as well as its current state.

In a situation where the politics of memorial culture has been continuously changing, severely neglecting, manipulating or misusing its monuments, what can we say about the alternative spaces/places of memory and conflict that emerged from this overall confusion? In a time when art of monuments is increasingly rejecting traditional static forms by leaving space for the audience to dynamically reflect on the marked object/practice/event/(space), and often also to actively participate in its recreation, how does the democratization of the media ecology and the alternative ways of communicating influence these developments.

By applying the principles of "connective memory" instead of classical notions of collective memory to the specific context of the memorial culture in former Yugoslavia (with the emphasis on Croatia), this paper will test and question the possibility of observing YouTube videos as monuments, and the social activity around them as the next step in the development/ degradation of the culture of memory.

I will try to present specific circumstances that had, in my opinion, led to fragmented cultural memory politics and problematic identity issues and caused the need for alternative spaces of memory. In order to evaluate the proposed notion of a monument, i will translate and adopt the characteristics of the classical physical one to the new digital monument, and in the end, is this something to be valued or ignored.

When it comes to the politics of memory/memorializton in Croatia (and other countries of former SFRY) the distant past tends to provoke little controversy, while the narratives, commemorations and monuments related to the troubled twentieth century, continue to occupy headlines. The ethical and ideological conflicts that emerged with the Second World War and were kept under control during the period of the SFRY, only to erupt in the 1990's Yugoslav war, remain a political battlefield to the present. (Pavlaković) These political transitions caused the reconfiguration of a society's culture of memory can well be seen in its physical representations - the monuments.

A part of the history that still lingers in the public discousions is the one of the so called former Yugoslavia. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) was proclaimed by the Partisans resistance movement during World War II until it was dissolved in 1992 amid the Yugoslav Wars. It was a socialist state and a federation made up of six socialist republics: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia. Serbia, in addition, included two autonomous provinces Vojvodina and Kosovo. (Wikipedia)

In multicultural Yugoslavia, the WWII was a layered and complex situation, since it was not only a war of liberation against the aggressor Nazi Germany, but aslo a civil war with complex oppositions between ethnic population groups (the terrorist and fascist Croatian Ustashes, the nationalist radical Serbian Chetniks, and the multiethnic anti-fascist Partisans).

Once the WWII was over, the former ideological opponents had to collectively form a new country, that resulted in a neutral position of the official policy line that was supposed to assure the bright future of the socialistic model society and smooth over all its former conflicts.

The event that determined the future and the character of the SFRY was the political and ideological separation of the Yugoslav president Tito and the Soviet leader Stalin, which took place in 1948. Since then the Yugoslav politics had been developing its own autonomous version of socialism that had led the creation of the third block – the Nonalignement Movement, making Yugoslavia the third side od the Cold War.

If the collective memory of a nation is represented by the memorials it chooses to erect, collective memory of the former Yugoslavia should be observed through the monumental structures that thematise(d) and celebrate(d) the revolutionary anti-fascist struggle. The style and aesthetics of the monuments changed with the mentioned key event of political separation from the Soviet regime. This reversal is seen in the rejection of the sculptural monuments (often figural portraiting of heroic leaders or patriotic workers in soc-realistical style) and acceptance of the progressive art tendencies and abstract forms (gigantic public plastics celebrating the eternity of the revolution).

Collective memory can serve as an instrument of power and change the ways in which events are remembered and recorded, or discarded. Politics built on ideological grounds often play a strong role in shaping of collective memory. "The topography of Tito's Yugoslavia was ideologically delineated in order to reinforce the Communist Party's monopoly over the past…."

There were once hundreds of them scattered throughout villages and rural deserted landscapes representing power, confidence and strength of Yugoslavia. They are (were) usually of gigantic scale and designed by different Yugoslavian sculptors and architects, the names well known in the context of the European contemporary art (Džamonja, Bakić, Bogdanović…). Up until the 1990s, they attracted millions of visitors, schoolchildren (young pioneers), military veterans, patriots, politicians, and mourners who had lost family in the WWII. The images reproduced in the mass media confirmed their strength and beauty even to the citizens that couldn't experience them by standing in front of them. They embodied all the values that the socialist country stood for, but only until the ideology supporting system collapsed.

After the death of Tito in 1980, rising ethnic nationalism in the late 1980s led to dissidence among the multiple ethnicities within the constituent republics, followed by collapse of inter-republic talks on transformation of the country and recognition of their independence by some European states in 1991. This led to the country collapsing on ethnic lines, followed by the final downfall and break of the country in 1992, and the start of the Yugoslav Wars.

"Many commentators on the war in Yugoslavia in the 1990s thus declared that the events unfolding were the inevitable extension of the Second World War. The fury unleashed upon the Spomeniks after 1992 was not merely settling the score with the old socialist system, but was also the exposure of that hidden history which had led to the reopening of Pandora's box in the first place."

Before, during and after the Yugoslav war, the monuments became targets of a newformed nationalist politics determined to recalibrate the memory culture of the former country replacing it with a more acceptable, Croatian one. "...textbooks had been changed, symbols removed, and new national cultures of memory constructed in place of the discredited Yugoslav one."

The "censorship" by ideological and ethno-national transformation of the monuments and public spaces in general included not only their removal by the authorities, but vandalism or complete destruction by paramilitaries or Croatian soldiers. In the 1990's, only in Croatia over three thousand Partisan memorials were damaged or destroyed. "The devastation of the monuments was particularly extensive in regions mostly affected by the war, they were shot at with machine guns, rocket launchers, tanks, and even blasted to pieces with set explosives. Others, notably Bakić's massive monument on Petrova Gora, were stripped for their valuable components and sold as scrap metal. "

The monuments that were meant to endure and to resist the transiency of time were completely abandoned, rarely visited and left there to decompose and rot. They stand unknown by the younger generations and are neglected by the older. Their symbolism is fading as is the memory in the collective mind of their host cultures.

Yet, while being ignored by the political structures the monuments became quite famous only because of the interest of a relatively small group of people outside of the former Yugoslavia - designers, photographers and other visual artists and blog consumers.

In only few months the word 'spomenik' (meaning monument in languages of the former Yugoslavia) gained a completly new meaning. When used as a Google search term gives by far more articles and pictures coming from international WEB pages and blogs (in english mostly). The word is even grammatically treated as a word coming from the english language (i. e. 'spomeniks', reffearing to the plural of 'spomenik'). The reason for this is "Spomenik: The End of History", a book by Belgian photographer Jan Kempenaers that presents series of 26 photographs of 25 monuments of former Yugoslavia, that has became widely known in artistic and design circles through various blogs and art/design magazines. Kempenaers toured around the former Yugoslavia region from 2006 to 2009, but with the help of a 1975 map of memorials.

"They have become submerged in a new age, rendered unintelligible to the current generation. Their symbolism has been lost in translation as the visual language has changed, their signals muffled by a shifted worldview. The monuments have been the objects of blind fury and now, of indifference. What remains is pure sculpture in a desolate landscape." The particular selection of photos, set side by side in a big format book, communicates something completely different than each of them would communicate separately. They are all shot in the same time of the day, from a human perspective, without people present. Widely distributed images of the 'Spomeniks' in this appearance and form decontextulizes their meaning degradating its simbolics to one of a dissolved country ("It is the memory of the socialist party that is all over now. And yet, this is precisely what enriches the monuments' meaning. In their dilapidated condition, they are no longer symbols of victory, but for the first time, true symbols of a newfound mourning.") or even to the level of pure aesthetic value ("Looking at the photographs one must admit to a certain embarrassment. We see the powerful beauty of the monumental sculptures and we catch ourselves forgetting the victims in whose name they were built.").

What is their meaning now, what are they communicating? On one hand, their physical condition and institutional neglect reflect a more general social historical fracturing now when their original ideologically driven meaning is no longer intelligible. And on the other hand, they are still of stunning beauty without any symbolic significances that communicates nothing but their

aesthetic values (i. e. some blogs are refearing to the monuments as the '25 Abandoned Yugoslavia Monuments that look like they're from the Future').

In order to understand the significance of the destruction and neglection of the monuments, one has to see the symbolics and wider context of such politics. The destruction of their physical state means the destruction of the valuable socialist legacy that had been nurtured for decades - the workers' rights and labor organizations, public health and education, public spaces and community institutions, industry and the economy. (WHW)

Instead, the new monuments with counter narratives have been erected. By fetishizing the purity of the of the nation, language, culture, etc., the new regime turned to historicism and the formation of national mythology while cutting out anything that with socialist conotations.

<!-- MORE ABOUT THE CURRENT SITUATION -->

Another indicator of a lost identity and the difficulties in dealing with the past can be seen in the emergence of a new kind of public art in the ex-Yugoslavia republics. Serbian artist, Aleksandra Domanović, refers to it in her video essay called by a coined name 'Turbo Sculpture' - an epiphenomenon of turbo culture. It refers to the depiction of popular non-national media celebrities in public sculpture projects across the former Yugoslavian nations.

In 'Turbo Sculpture' Domanovic questions the emergence of a new kind of public art in the ex-Yugoslavia republics, which she defines in reference to 'Turbofolk', a popular style of music in the region, suggesting that these sculptures remain neutral in the turmoil of political disputes. Unlike war memorials, these public monuments do not refer to a common history of a specific site or occurrence; they are based, instead, on modern popular culture that knows no genius loci. Instead of war heroes, who would have been immortalized by classical monuments, local authorities now decide to eternalize Hollywood stars and heroes of the Western world in bronze. Bruce Lee, Johnny Depp, Rocky Balboa, and other film characters or public personae (here the real and the fictive figure blur) provide new points of identification for the community in place of celebrating national heroes, following the atrocities of war and the damaged reputations of political leaders.

It is commonly argued that the rejection of the traditional regional/political context of civic monuments (leading to the turbo sculpture age) is a condition of the post-traumatic recalibration of identity and ideology that occurred following the Yugoslav Wars of the 1990s.

"The Political and economic turmoil of the early 1990s Yugoslavia rendered the society compliant enough for the concept of 'turbo culture' to gain momentum. With all its exaggerations, inordinateness and random amalgamations of both local and global ornamentation, turbo eventually became a prefix for social and media phenomena of the war and post-war period. As a result terms such as turbo politics, turbo television, turbo architecture and turbo urbanism developed…"

The Turbo idea in general rejects the nationalist and extreme ethnic views of the wartime period and refuses to accept the leaders and fighters of that era as heroes. The painter Mileta Prodanovic served on a committee to create a monument to those lost in the war. The committee dissolved after being unable to agree on a design. Prodanovic sees value in Turbo Sculpture: These Hollywood monuments are a subversive response [to the governments of that time], which they are mocking. People realize that many of our soldiers in the wars of the 1990s were criminals who stole, robbed and killed. So people are searching for alternative role models and this is a healthy rejection of nationalism.

Not everyone thinks highly of Turbo Sculpture. Milica Tomic, an artist who also served on the committee, said: This turning to Rocky or Tarzan is unhealthy and dangerous.We need to find a way of representing our grief, our responsibility and our despair. Until we do that, Serbia cannot come to terms with the present and the future.

Tomic represents grief, etc. by decorating herself with fake wounds and posing for photographs. She is a very serious artist. Turbo Sculpture lacks seriousness. And, of course, despair. Sometimes people who think a lot about conceptual art cannot recognize a non-grant funded concept that is right in front of them.

"In place of a top-down, one-to-many vertical cascade from centralised industry sources we discover today bottom-up, many-to-many, horizontal, peer-to-peer communication. 'Pull' media challenge 'push' media; open structures challenge hierarchical structures; micro-production challenges macro-production; open-access amateur production challenges closed access, elite-professions; economic and technological barriers to media production are transformed by cheap, democratised, easy-to-use technologies."

In our media age, and particularly during the last decade of increasing digitalization, this generates a flow of, and production of, second hand memories. Particular narratives and images are reproduced and reframed, yet also questioned and contested through new images and so forth.

"New media machinery, driven by the availability, portability and pervasiveness of digital devices converges with a memorial culture determined to re-consume past conflicts and catastrophes."[1]

In his essay '7/7 and connective memory: Interactional trajectories of remembering in post-scarcity culture' Andrew Hoskins is introducing a model of "connective memory" according to which the individual memory is generated through the series of contacts between people, digital technologies and media, rather than as product of individual or collective remembrances.

According to Andrew Hoskins, in the age of compulsive culture of digitalization and archiving, a different kind of mass has been developing. "The new mass is constituted through its connectivity, rather than 'collectivity', and thus doesn't 'possess' collective memory in a way that traditional models of 'the audience' and 'mass media' have been attributed such a condition (cf. Dayan and Katz, 1992)."

Events that are subjected to this kind of media treatment are the ones that "...acquired a substantial and recognizable memorial status in terms of the relative extent of their ongoing presence in media–public discourses as signifying a particular relevance and meaning in 'memory' to a given community of persons."[1]
However, despite the todays mainstream media monumentalization of certain images and narratives, the meanings of recycled news data perpetuates space for speculations and contestations around personal and political narratives on the events.

Drip-by-drip remediations in the mainstream media, as well as in the alternative media formats as news portal commenting space, forums and even YouTube comments or other social media, are opening space for speculations and contestations around personal and political narratives on the events in question. This is all opposing to the monumentalization of the narrative. As opposed to the monopolization of the media space and the truth, the digital technologies had led to democratization of the media which now allows milions of versions of the truth. Each time one is confronted with one of those truths, an opportunity for a memory modification. "The continual emergence of sets of 'new' pasts, a 'new memory' challenges unified or unifying 'collective' orientations to the past."[1]

The moment of confrontation Hoskins defines as the 'connective turn'. "The connective turn is the massively increased abundance, pervasiveness and accessibility of digital technologies, devices and media, shaping an ongoing re-calibration of time, space (and place) and memory by people as they connect with, inhabit and constitute increasingly both dense and diffused social net- works."

One could say that the everyday emergence of the 'new truths' and 'new memory' serves as a very powerful tool for demonumentalization of the past and present narratives in a certain society. The mediation and re-mediation of the past events is even more diffused and unpredictable when dealing with images. While The New Media connectivity is processing the narratives of the WWII in one way, the memory of its physical embodiment , the monuments is experiencing a demonumen- talizadion by decontextualization.

The digital media that produce, reproduce, and remediate digital content, contribute to a more fluid, diffused and unpredictable media/memory ecology that results with the interpenetrations that can shape different and competing narratives. In this way the digital mass audience can influence the demonumentalization of the subject in question. The narrative of the second WWII is now available to thousands of active narrators, while the images representing the events and ideology get more disconnected from the original context which results with demonumentalize of the subject in question.

Drip-by-drip remediations in the mainstream media, as well as in the alternative media formats as news portal commenting space, forums and even YouTube comments or other social media, are opening space for speculations and contestations around personal and political narratives of the events in question. This is all opposing to the monumentalization of those narratives. As opposed to the monopolization of the media space and the truth, digital technologies have led to its democratization, which now allows milions of versions of the truth. Each time one is confronted with one of those truths, an opportunity for a memory modification appears. "The continual emergence of sets of 'new' pasts, a 'new memory' challenges unified or unifying 'collective' orientations to the past."[1]

--- questioning the future of monuments ---
"Monuments are symbols, they reflect common values and as such they exist not merely as the embodyment of an idea, but also as places of memory. Monuments are facts in space that penetrate the (sub)consious thus becoming marks of identity or simply places that we recognise and remember." (Šimpraga)

Brojni će autori i autorice korektno ponoviti danas već udžbeničku tezu da je tradicionalna funkcija spomenika primarno ideološka (tek jedan, vrlo simptomatičan, primjer: "Monumenti, spomenici i ostali dijelovi hard memorije uglavnom se rade za veličanje nacionalnih vrijednosti, oni govore "istinu", zapravo su oni ta materijalizirana istina. Ono što iz tog kruga nacionalnog ispada, ono što je nadnacionalno ili čak izvannacionalno, to se nevoljko ili nikako pripušta u polje materijaliziranog sjećanja.")(1), ali istovremeno neće postaviti u sumnju potrebu da se sjećanje materijalizirano u formi spomen(ik)a nastavi proizvoditi – najveći se dio prigovora i polemika odnosi na to "koju" prošlost treba "ospomeničiti" i/ili što "estetski" bolje odgovara urbanom habitusu, čime se čitava rasprava o spomenicima zapravo unazađuje za više desetljeća.

--- criticizing the traditional monument ---
Još u prethodnom stoljeću ideja memorijalnog spomen(ik)a i njegova mjesta u suvremenoj kulturi rasla je obrnuto proporcionalno sa smanjenjem tradicionalnih shvaćanja o vječnosti/ bezvremenosti samih spomenika. Jednom kada je prihvaćeno da spomenici nužno posreduju sjećanje, čak i kada im je cilj potaći ga, počelo ih se promatrati kao izmještanje sjećanja koja su trebali otjeloviti. Drugim riječima, inzistiranje da je sjećanje fiksirano u mjestu u (javnom) prostoru onemogućivalo je razmjenjivost spomenika kao kulturalnih artefakata. Lewis Mumford(2) još 1938. proglašava "ničeansku" smrt spomenika kao bespomoćno inkompatibilnih s modernističkim gradom: klasični spomenici su statični; oni su mumifikacija prošlosti umjesto polaganja nade u biološku regeneraciju, u fiksiranje slika u nove generacije i ostaju tek tašti, autoreferentni, "veći od života" – ukratko, nesposobni za komemorativnost koja bi im trebala biti intrinzična.

--//--
Spomenici se proizvode unutar dominantnog okvira vrijednosti, kao elementi u konstruiranju nacionalne povijesti i pretpostavljaju barem djelomični konsenzus vrijednosti bez kojega njihov narativ ne bi mogao biti prepoznat iako pojedini spomenici ne zadržavaju svoju vrijednost kako specifična osoba/događaj blijedi u kolektivnom sjećanju, a pojedini artefakti mogu biti estetski (ili na druge načine) odbojni. Kao opća kategorija kulturalnih objekata, međutim, spomenici su prisutni u prostoru većine gradova predstavljajući stabilnost koja prekriva, sakriva interne i inherentne kontradikcije u društvu i preživljavaju dnevn(opolitičk)e fluktuacije historiografije (ili barem jedan njihov dio). Većina u društvu je nagovorena, uz druge građanske institucije i prisutnošću spomenika, da prihvate te kontradikcije čime spomenik postaje sredstvo društvene kontrole manje brutalno i jeftinije od naoružanih čuvara poretka.

--//--
Spomenici su, pak, u dvojakom odnosu prema vremenu: odr(a)žavaju prošlost ili njezinu imitaciju, ali su podignuti da bi impresionirali suvremenu publiku/javnost odnosom vladajuće elite spram prošlosti (monumentalnošću-u-vremenu) i trajnošću samih artefakata, čime se i koncept aktualne vlasti predstavlja ne samo kao dominantan već i "povijesno" utemeljen i opravdiv.

Na taj se način stvara zatvorene, statične povijesti, pokušavajući "uzglobiti" vrijeme, koje Ernesto Laclau smatra jedinim procesom dislokacije koji otvara prostor za (političku) promjenu. Složili se ili ne s Laclauovim kritikom prostornog kao aposlutno nepodesnog za unos drugačijeg, za promjenu, za odsustvo determinacije, odnosno slobodu, mora se priznati da je posebno spomenike (5) iznimno teško, ako ne i nemoguće, "razrahliti", upisati im novo, drugačije značenje.

-- prednost yt spomenika --
Ono u čemu Lefebvre ipak griješi jest mogućnost "drugačije" upotrebe upravo spomenika. Njihova
je funkcija, bez obzira govorimo li o klasičnim, figurativnim ili suvremenim, apstraktnim; bez obzira
govorimo li o imperijalnim, nacionalnim ili anti-spomenicima definirana i definitivna, hegemonijska
i isključiva. Mogućnosti subverzivnih taktika – o kojima govori deCerteau – metamorfiranje
teksta očima čitatelja, odbijanje slijeđenja zadanoga linearnog koda čitanja, "naseljavanje" teksta
vlastitim procedurama, sjećanjima, metaforama... posuđivanje ili privremeno zaposjedanje
prostora u kojemu se potom odvijaju vlastite prakse, stvaranje "distinktivnog prostora aproprijacije
koji se nikada ne može reducirati na ono što se čita"(7) upravo se u spomenicima, zbog njihove
statičnosti i konačnosti u značenju ne mogu zadovoljavajuće poostvariti.

------> the end of monument as we know it <------------
Ima li u tome i takvome gradu 21. stoljeća uopće mjesta za postavljanje novih spomenika?
Teško, zapravo. Okvir o raspravi o spomenicima razlikuje se ovisno o profesionalnoj perspektivi i
afinitetima. Od nekritičkih opisivanja spomenika isključivo kao objekata u geografskom pejzažu ili
predmeta kunsthistoričarske znatiželje do iščitavanja kroz kulturalnu, ekonomsku, urbanističku...
povijest, posebno u slučajevima kada spomenici zadržavaju na sebi interes javnosti kao kulturalni
označitelji iako je izvorna namjena davno izgubljena (12). Bird i Molyneux promatraju ih kao
nametanje ideologije; Darke i Warner kao označitelje prostora; Urry i Hewison kao potrošačke,
konzumeristične objekte... Ono što je, međutim, svim navedenim, kao i brojnim drugim pristupima
zajedničko jest izrazito kritičan stav prema funkciji i ulozi spomenika u suvremenom gradu i
suvremenom društvu.

----------> klasični spomenici jednostavno više ne dolaze u obzir pri iole ozbiljnijem urbanom
planiranju <------------
Dodatno, pojavljivanje ne-gradova i ne-mjesta, privatizacija urbanih centara, konverzija prostora
sjećanja (poput muzeja) u trgovačke centre i opća konstrukcija "simulakruma pravog života"
pretvorili su urbani život u gradu u labirint slika i praksi koji sve više nalikuje na stotine televizijskih
programa kojima se kruži jednostavnim "channel surfingom", u kojima nema dominantnog
programa, pa tako niti dominantne povijesti – ona je tek jedan u nizu kanala, svakako ne
najgledaniji. I sama umjetnost/praksa spomeničkih obilježja danas odbacuje tradicionalne statične
forme i ostavlja prostor publici da dinamički promišlja obilježeni predmet/praksu/događaj, a
nerijetko i da aktivno su/djeluje u njegovom (re)kreiranju. Pred/post/modernistično shvaćanje
vremena kao cikličnoga nasuprot modernistinoj linearnosti postoje tako sve više nužnost u bilo
kojem pokušaju obilježavanja sjećanja, čime klasični spomenici jednostavno više ne dolaze u obzir
pri iole ozbiljnijem urbanom planiranju.